IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v. 22-CR-6009-CJS-MJP

JOHN DOUGLAS LOONEY,

Defendant

DEFENDENT'S RESPONSE TO GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE DATED MAY 24, 2023

We have demonstrated through various means that the methodology employed by Office Turner to determine a downloader is false. We have supplied the Corbett case and other FBI cases which demonstrated the methodology relied upon by Agent Turner is false. We want the opportunity to explore whether Office Turner had knowledge of these FBI cases that had multiple connected nodes prior to February 2019.

Corbett Data demonstrates requests are not distributed "roughly evenly"

The government argues that Officer Turner's Affidavit, "clearly and repeatedly explains that the division (of requests for a file) is 'roughly' even.'Roughly' signals that the division will not be exact" (Government's Reply, p.7).

The government further states that there will be "outliers", meaning that the number of blocks of a file that a downloader requests may be much higher or much lower with "roughly even" distribution. The government cites the *Corbett* case as an example of an outlier where two different, connected FBI nodes received a request for 4 blocks and 42 blocks for one file of interest (FOI). Regarding a different FOI in *Corbett,*

the government claims requests for 10, 11, 17, and 29 blocks are 'roughly even' (Govt. Reply, p.7).

The above contentions show the methodology used to determine a downloader to be meaningless. 42 and 4 are not roughly even, nor are 10, 11, 17, and 29. To label the fewest number of requests an outlier indicates a bias towards concluding that one is a downloader no matter the number of requests of a file. Why isn't 42 the outlier?

The government now admits that Freenet uses friend of a friend routing (FOAF) of requests (Govt. Reply p. 7, 8). We have shown that with FOAF routing the number of requests received is meaningless, since requests are sent to 'locations', not evenly shared with peers. The *Corbett* data and other Freenet cases shows requests are not at all distributed roughly evenly. If this Formula were a test used by law enforcement and in four tests one resulted in 'guilty' and three found 'not guilty' the test could never be considered by any court to establish probable cause.

The government claims that Officer Turner never uses the term 'even share', but says requests are distributed 'roughly' evenly (Govt. Reply p.7). Regarding the FOI's in *Corbett*, this data proves that 29, 17, 11, and 10 are not roughly even (Id). Nor are FOI #2 (42 and 4) roughly even, nor are FOI #3 (12, 5, 10 and 25) roughly even. This data presents objective evidence that Officer Turner's description of Freenet is false. This data also shows that Freenet operates as designed; namely, FOAF routing which produces significantly uneven distribution of requests.

Levine Formula cannot produce meaningful results

The government claims a Formula developed by Dr. Brian Levine can identify downloaders of files in Freenet. They state that the Formula is meaningless to anyone who does not have a degree in mathematics, yet this Formula is used to identify Freenet users as downloaders of files (Govt. Reply, p.11).

After extensive research, we have found no independent academic papers that validate the Levine Formula or methodology. We have provided the court with an academic paper by a Freenet developer, Dr. Babenhauserheide, stating that the Formula employs wrong math, wrong model, and wrong false positives. The government states that Dr. Levine's 2017 and 2020 papers have been cited in numerous peer reviewed academic papers, (Govt. Reply, p.12). We request copies of the same.

In reference to the Formula, the government states that the model is not an exact re-creation of Freenet's software (Govt. Reply p.5). Levine's test is only verifying his assumption of Freenet operation, not Freenet in actuality.

Why has this approach been accepted in other Freenet cases? Because the Formula which the government states is meaningless to anyone not trained in statistics, is assumed to be valid and has not been effectively challenged. The Formula has not been independently verified, the peer review process does not validate the Formula, and the government claims that Levine's test of the Levine Formula (even though the government states that the Formula does not mirror the Freenet code) is sufficient.

In the case herein, with two of the three FOI's, the number of requests received by the FBI node was outside the range of the Formula's prediction. In spite of this fact, Officer Turner concluded it was substantially more likely than not that the defendant was the original requestor.

Freenet source code is relevant

In describing the operation of the Formula, the government says *If the model the Formula is based on were an exact recreation of Freenet's source code, then actual number of blocks requested by an original requestor would always fall exactly within the range predicted by the Formula*. (Govt. Reply, p.5). Since falling within the range is described by the government as determining a downloader, it would seem reasonable that an objective of the government would be to show that the number of requests do fall within the predicted range. Otherwise, the Formula is meaningless.

The government says the model is not a perfect mirror of the software, (Govt. Reply p.6), but if the Formula is used to determine a downloader, it must be a mirror of the software; otherwise, there is nothing to prevent strictly arbitrary results, as implied by the *Corbett* results. Finally, the government admits that the actual number of block requests the FBI node herein received from the defendant's device fell outside of the Formula's estimated range (Id.)

Freenet does operate as designed

The government repeatedly claims that Freenet does not operate as designed (Govt. Reply p.7). The government offers no proof of this while we have shown multiple peer reviewed academic papers that verify how Freenet actually operates, with extensive testing. Freenet is continuously tested, with multiple metrics monitored. We supplied a document with our last submission titled "2014-09-23-Fixing-the-link-length-distribution-in-Freenet". The point of this submission was to show how extensively Freenet is tested by the developers. If Freenet did not work as designed, it simply would not work.

We have provided to the Court over 12 peer reviewed academic papers all of which validate that Freenet operates as designed. The one exception is the 2014 Roos paper which while not claiming that Freenet did not operate as designed, it operated inefficiently causing long delays in satisfying requests. This was resolved in 2014.

Information on cases of multiple FBI nodes similar to *Corbett*

We found additional spreadsheets from other lawyers who also have Freenet cases. The *Corbett* data came from Thomas Church of Pate, Johnson & Church, Atlanta, Ga. For the other cases the lawyers have requested that personally identifiable data be redacted.

In the affidavits for *Corbett*, the other two cases, and the case herein, we found the following statement: *" Then, relying on the fact that an original or first level request is divided in approximately equally (sic) parts between each of the original requestor's peers and an intermediary or second-level request is subdivided evenly between the*

intermediary user's peers (see Figures 1 and 2), the formula determines whether it is more probable than not that a request received by a law enforcement computer for a specific number of blocks of a known "file of interest" was received from an original requestor or a mere intermediary." (Affidavit for Search Warrant, Corbett, Ex. D, Napier Affidavit, May, 17, 2023)

The above statement in the Turner Affidavit (par. 45) is false, and is material to the case. After finding the *Corbett* data showing multiple FBI nodes each connected (as shown by the IP address) to the same node, and each receiving a different number of requests, we looked for more examples. We found the following:

- The spreadsheets showing the data collected (or a subset of the data) are <u>not</u> provided to the magistrate along with the associated affidavit, they are only produced through discovery.
- The data shows in nearly <u>every</u> instance that the requests are **<u>NOT</u>** distributed in "approximately equally /sic/ parts between each of the original requestor's peer"
- Multiple FBI nodes connected to a suspect is the common case, and occurred in 24 of the 27 instances we found.
- There is no mention in the associated affidavits that there were multiple FBI nodes connected to the alleged downloader with <u>different</u> results.
- There is no mention of multiple observing nodes in the investigating officer's notes.
- The results show false positive rates of 50% to 75%, not the 98% accuracy claimed.

We looked at separate Freenet cases, including *Corbett*, involving 9 separate spreadsheets showing data on 27 files of interest. In these instances of file monitoring data, 3 involved only 1 FBI node, 12 involved 2 FBI nodes, 6 involved 3 FBI nodes, and 6 involved 4 FBI nodes.

The following chart is a summary of this data. The first column is the case; the next column identifies each of the 3 files monitored for each instance; next column shows the number of requests as calculated in Officer Turner's Figure 1 example (blocks/peers);

the next columns show the actual number of requests received by the FBI nodes. The orange highlights are the data identified in the affidavits as the basis for identifying the downloader. No mention is made of the other data. Since in every case where there are multiple FBI nodes, one node is identified as identifying the downloader, while the other nodes are assumed to be connected to a relayer, but since all the FBI nodes are connected to the same node (by IP address), the other nodes are now false positives.

There are 27 instances noted, for three separate FBI cases, in three different states (NY, and two others redacted). The actual number of requests that were received from the alleged downloader is shown for each instance.

		Even Share					
		Requests	Number of Requests Actually Received				False
		Figure 1	LE node # 1	LE node # 2	LE node # 3	LE node # 4	Positives
US v Corbett, New York	**FOI #1**	**27**	**29**	11	10	17	75%
108.30.166.37	**FOI #2**	**50**	42	4			50%
	FOI #3	**24**	25	12	5	19	75%
Wisconsin v Mcxxxxxxx	**FOI #1**	**39**	83	39			50%
xx.xx.173.202	**FOI #2**	**128**	96	202			50%
	FOI #3	**30**	65	32			50%
US v Case X chart 1	FOI #1	**19**	21	1	3		67%
xx.xxx.58.45	FOI #2	**18**	24				
	FOI #3	**16**	22				
US v Case X chart 2	**FOI #1**	**21**	21	1	3		67%
xx.xxx.58.45	**FOI #2**	**44**	43	7			50%
	FOI #3	**16**	36				
US v Case X chart 3	**FOI #1**	**20**	53	15	10		67%
xx.xxx.58.45	**FOI #2**	**48**	12	143	57		67%
	FOI #3	**10**	25	7	5		67%
US v Case X chart 4	**FOI #1**	**16**	**1**	**20**	**40**	**8**	75%
xx.xxx.58.45	**FOI #2**	**35**	70	3			50%
	FOI #3	**23**	**13**	81			50%
US v Case X chart 5	**FOI #1**	**69**	429	78	212	305	75%
xx.xxx.58.45	**FOI #2**	**399**	286	108			50%
	FOI #3	**20**	33	24	8	1	75%
US v Case X chart 6	**FOI #1**	**71**	**66**	**7**			50%
xx.xxx.58.45	**FOI #2**	**79**	65	15	2	12	75%
	FOI #3	**70**	36	72	2		67%

US v Case X chart 7	FOI #1	**20**	27	20			50%
xx.xxx.58.45	FOI #2	**33**	14	30			50%
	FOI #3	**49**	48	28			50%

Checking the actual requests received clearly proves that in every case with multiple FBI nodes, requests are not distributed evenly. Even share is not used in Freenet. The number of requests cannot be predicted and compared.

The prosecution claimed that the number of requests could be different by a factor of 10, and still be roughly even. This comes from Officer Turner's paragraph 50, and Figure 2: *50. Note that the number of requests the law enforcement computer receives if User X is an original requestor (node A sending 100 requests) is substantially larger (often by a factor of 10) than the number of requests the law enforcement computer would receive if User X were merely a second level or intermediary requestor (node B sending 10 requests).*

The theory described by Officer Turner's Figure 1 is that the number of requests is 'roughly' the same for each of the directly connected peers. If the number of requests was less by a factor of 10, it would be less for all the directly connected peers. With even share, all the connected peers must receive roughly the same number of requests. Also, there is no explanation as to why a connected node would receive less than the even share number of requests. According to the Figure 1 description, the 1000 requests (fixed) would be divided by 10 (fixed average number of peers), so why would it ever be other than 100?

According to Figure 1 and even share, each directly connected node will receive "roughly" the same number of requests. As shown by the data collected by the FBI, this never happens in actual operation.

Clearly it is **not a fact** that the number of requests are divided and distributed roughly evenly. It did not happen in any case we reviewed, and given that the affidavit is basically the same in all cases, Officer Turner must have known this.

Comments about the *Corbett* (NYC) data from Freenet developer Dr. Arne Babenhauserheide:

"But the actual case that shows clearly that they don't receive even share is FOI#3, LE#3026 vs LE#3083.

> *LE#3026 received 5 requests, LE#3083 received 19 requests, even though LE#3026 connected *before* LE#3083 and disconnected *after*.*
>
> *That's almost a factor 4 difference between two nodes and the one with *fewer* requests received was connected for *longer*.*
>
> *It's almost certain that this was relayed. Didn't anyone from the persecution double check that?*
>
> *(Besides that this indicates that our routing works well at relayers, because it's what we would expect for a relayer if the location of EL#3083 is close to the location of the target node but LE#3026 was not.)"*

	US v Corbett, New York									
			FOI #1			FOI #2			FOI #3	
	LE #2763	LE #2618	LE #3026	LE #3083	LE #2854	LE #2751	LE #2763	LE #3036	LE #3026	LE #3083
First Block Observed	2019 11/05	2019 11/05	2019 11/05	2019 11/05	2019 10/14	2019 10/14	2019 11/05	2019 11/04	2019 11/05	2019 11/05
	14:31:53	**14:33:43**	**14:33:55**	**14:34:32**	**16:12:33**	**16:12:57**	14:17:55	**15:48:22**	**14:16:25**	**14:16:34**
Last Block Observed	**15:20:11**	**15:08:25**	**15:21:19**	**15:21:20**	**17:28:52**	**17:10:30**	**15:05:53**	**14:59:51**	**15:05:26**	**15:00:53**
Time required to receive requests	0:48:18	0:34:42	0:47:24	0:46:48	1:16:19	0:57:33	0:47:58	23:11:29	0:49:01	0:44:19
Minimum blocks	1403	1403	1403	1403	2774	2774	1218	1218	1218	1218
Maximum blocks	2815	2815	2815	2815	5575	5575	2452	2452	2452	2452
Requests received	29	11	10	17	42	4	25	12	5	19
Average peers of suspect node	51.4	50.5	51.9	51.5	55.4	55.8	50.8	51.6	52.2	50.5
% of even-share of min blocks	**106.2%**	**39.6%**	**37.0%**	**62.4%**	**83.9%**	**8.0%**	**104.3%**	**50.8%**	**21.4%**	**78.8%**
Even share number - expected requests	**27**	28	27	27	50	50	24	24	23	24
Range of Expected Requests	**27 to 55**	28 to 56	27 to 54	27 to 55	50 to 101	50 to 100	24 to 48	24 to 48	23 to 47	24 to 49

In addition to noting that requests are <u>not distributed roughly evenly</u>, we found that the affidavits in each case are fundamentally the same except for the subset of the specific data collected by the FBI nodes which identifies the suspect as the downloader.

In each affidavit the materially false, even share models of Figure 1 and Figure 2 drawings are included with the following statement: *"As noted below, this design can help law enforcement distinguish between a user that is the original requestor of a file and one that is merely forwarding the request of another user."* The FBI data from

these cases make it clear beyond a doubt that this is not the design or operation of Freenet, as the actual data shows requests are not distributed roughly evenly.

As attachments, we include the summarized data from the spreadsheets and the raw data (actual FBI spreadsheets). These spreadsheets were provided as discovery in the cases and not included with the affidavits.

Response to Government Regarding Franks Hearing

A. Request for Franks Hearing

Officer Turner's statements regarding Freenet's operation are described in ¶45, ¶50, and in ¶18 which states that Figure 1 and 2 show: *"this design can help law enforcement distinguish between a user that is the original requestor of a file and one that is merely forwarding the request of another user."* All these statements are materially false and are not supported by the data we found in other Freenet cases.

The government uses the term 'roughly even' to explain the results that do not comply with Officer Turner's description of Freenet operation. We do not understand how dividing one number by another (1000/10) can be 'rough' and not even.

Officer Turner describes his experience as: *"I am currently assigned to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBD in the Child Exploitation Task Force as a Task Force officer (TFO). I am cross-deputized as a Deputy United States Marshal. My duties include investigating federal crimes including violations of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 2252 and,2252A*." We naturally assume that he has more than a cursory understanding of both Freenet and the Levine Formula. We allege that virtually every statement in the Affidavit concerning the operation of Freenet is false.

B. OFC. TURNER'S AFFIDAVIT INACCURATELY DESCRIBED HOW FREENET DISTRIBUTES REQUESTS

What is done in each example is to divide the number of requests (a number provided in the manifest) by the number of peers (measured by the FBI node). So 1000 is divided by 10 to get 100 requests to each peer. This is simple math and results in an

exact number as the answer, there is nothing approximate or 'rough' about simple division.

The government can complain about the term 'even share', but that is what Officer Turner describes at every turn.

Officer Turner's example is a hypothetical example to try and use the methodology when the data does not actually fit the Formula. He does not give any explanation of how this would actually happen. The government then provides the following: *"If the model the Formula is based on were an exact recreation of Freenet's source code, then actual number of blocks requested by an original requestor would always fall exactly within the range predicted by the Formula"(Govt. Reply, p.5)* The Formula is <u>not</u> based on an accurate recreation of the Freenet source code. If this is the case the Formula must be ignored.

The government goes on to explain: *"Ofc. Turner chose an example where the actual number of blocks falls close to but outside of the predicted range in order to demonstrate that the model is not a perfect mirror of the software."* (Govt. Reply, p.10) If the model is not accurate how can it be used to determine probable cause?

The government says: "*Even the results generated by the application of the Formula to the download requests at issue showed that it generated an estimate, because the actual number of block requests Ofc. Turner received from the defendant's device fell outside of the Formula's estimated range."* (Govt. Reply, p.10) Thus, based on the Formula there was no probable cause to believe defendant was a downloader.

We vehemently challenge the term 'roughly' that the prosecution continues to use. The claim is that the number of requests can be widely divergent because the division is rough (for some unknown reason), but the numbers are used as if they are not rough and can accurately predict how many requests a connected node will receive. If the defendant receives this number or more, then a determination that the defendant is the downloader is made.

Data collected in United States v. Corbett is inconsistent with Ofc. Turner's description

We frankly do not understand how 29, 17, 11, and 10 in Corbett, can possibly be considered roughly even. Even is defined as 'steady, even, equable mean **not varying throughout a course or extent**'. With this definition 'roughly even' is an oxymoron.

From the footnote: *"In the Corbett case, Node #2751's receipt of a request for only 4 blocks of File of Interest #2 is a perfect example of an outlier."* (Govt. Reply, p.7) Since we only have 2 data points, 42 and 4, we would claim that 42 is the outlier, and since we are left with 4 as the only data point this could not have been claimed as identifying a downloader.

Freenet's source code is very relevant - it defines the operation of Freenet.

The government states: *"Ofc. Turner's affidavit asserts that, in practice, when Freenet's nodes follow all the complex friend of a friend routing directions that the source code dictates, the result is that requests for blocks end up being distributed in roughly even shares among a user's peers. The defense has not submitted any evidence that this is not, in practice, the case."* (Govt. Reply, p.8) The data from *Corbett* and other cases we have provided clearly proves that this is **not** the case in practice.

The government now concedes that FOAF routing is used by Freenet but claims that this is the design and not how Freenet operates in practice. The government makes this claim without providing any evidence. We have provided links to the actual Freenet source code, which is how it actually works. This is supported by multiple academic papers, including the law enforcement Black Ice project.

The government states: *"The defense has still not submitted any admissible evidence that tends to undermine the accuracy of the Formula's prediction." (Govt. Reply, p.8) "Ofc. Turner chose an example where the actual number of blocks falls close to but outside of the predicted range in order to demonstrate that the model is not a perfect mirror of the software"* (Govt. Reply, p.6). If the Formula is not an accurate model of the software then it is not a predictive model of Freenet as to how requests are distributed or many requests will be received.

We would refer to the prosecution's earlier statement about the Formula: *"Even the results generated by the application of the Formula to the download requests at issue showed that it generated an estimate, because the actual number of block requests the (sic) Ofc. Turner received from the defendant's device fell outside of the Formula's estimated range."* If the Formula is accurate and the data fell outside the range predicted by the Formula, there is no basis for probable cause. Can't have both.

Finally, the government has not provided any independent verification of the Formula's accuracy.

C. THE LEVINE FORMULA IS UNRELIABLE

We have provided multiple peer reviewed academic papers that show studies and testing of Freenet operation. The government has shown no independent studies of the Levine Formula.

Data allegedly collected in the Corbett case is inconsistent with the Levine Formula

The relevant issue is the inconsistent results, 1 of the four from *Corbett* indicates one result and 3 indicate a different result. It needs to be pointed out that this was not revealed in the Affidavit, or presented to the Magistrate, which only indicated one result identifying the downloader. We showed earlier in our Reply through a chart, 27 instances of an FBI node identifying a downloader while at the same time in 24 of those instances other FBI nodes did not identify the same node as a downloader. That is nearly 90% of the time another FBI node did not identify the downloader.

Dr. Arne Babenhauserheide's analyzed the Formula and found its results to be meaingless

The government questions the validity of Dr. Babenhauserheide's analysis of the Formula, but does not offer any independent analysis. Freenet is a computer program that is defined by its source code. This is true of any computer program, and it seems obvious that to test it or predict results, the test must model the source code. "*Only a model that is identical to Freenet's source code could accurately predict whether a*

particular device is an original requestor or mere relayer." (Napier Affidavit, Exhibit E).

We do not understand why the government claims that Dr. Babenhauserheide did not test the Formula. He shows a computer program that would execute the Formula for various test cases and finds the results of the Formula "meaningless" (Napier Aff. , Exhibit E).

The government has stated in their response that the Formula is not an accurate model of the Freenet software. The government states: "*However, Dr. Levine's testing has shown that an even share model does, in practice, accurately predict whether a particular device is an original requestor. Dr. Levine has tested the model in Freenet.*" (Govt. Reply, p.11) The 2% error rate identified by Dr. Levine is simply a test of a model which they admit is not an accurate representation of Freenet, and therefore is meaningless. Note that the government now refers to the Levine method as 'even share'.

It is relevant that Ofc. Turner's affidavit did not contain a copy of the actual Formula

We were not aware that Officer Turner had apparently provided a summary of their Formula to the Judge in 'layman's' terms. "Ofc. Turner initially provided a copy of Dr. Levine's 2017 paper (Dkt. 78-4), which includes the Formula, to Judge Payson. However, the Judge returned the paper and asked Ofc. Turner to summarize the Formula in laymen's terms. Without explanation, the Formula is meaningless to anyone who does not have a degree in mathematics". This summary was not included in the Affidavit, and we have not had the opportunity to question the Officer about this. The Formula calculates a probability as to the identity of the downloader. This calculated probability has never been stated. We believe this is an area that should be explored in a Franks hearing.

The government claims that the Levine 2017 paper has been cited by 10 peer reviewed academic papers (Govt. Reply, p.12) We provided 12 peer reviewed academic papers that described the operation of Freenet and detailed extensive testing of the Freenet network. We identified these papers and provided the papers to the

government and included the papers as exhibits in our motion. The government has not done this. We do not know what these 10 papers are or the nature of the citations. Do these papers actually attempt to verify the claims made by the Levine paper?

The government supplied one academic paper, Levine 2017, to make the claim that the Levine Formula would identify a downloader. We supplied 12 papers that described FOAF routing showing why the number of requests, high or low, is a meaningless number. The government has supplied no independent verification of the Formula, and Officer Turner did not show or explain the Formula in the Affidavit.

Finally, the government has provided no independent proof of the Levine Formula or methodology. The Formula is never shown in any affidavit, and the Formula is not evaluated and the results shown in any affidavit. The Formula is only claimed, without proof, to be highly accurate, and details are never provided.

The FBI data indicates a Reckless disregard in the Affidavit if the results were the same before 2019

The government states: "as the affidavit lays out, all the information at Ofc. Turner's disposal—his training, his experience, his conversations with other members of law enforcement, and his review of applicable case law—told him that the Formula was a reliable method for assessing the likelihood that evidence of child pornography would be found at a particular location" (Govt. Reply, p. 13)

The *Corbett* case was a year later than the case herein, however the point with *Corbett* and the other cases we found was to offer proof, using the FBI's own data, that the Levine Formula was false. We saw almost 90% of the instances in the data we found, that the Levine methodology was false. Our ability to find other FBI cases from the 2017 or 2018 time frame is dependent upon other lawyers contacting us about cases that most likely were resolved several years ago. However, our assumption is that examples such as those we found do exist.

The academic papers we submitted were not difficult to find and showed that Freenet did not operate as Officer Turner described. We assume that the Black Ice project paper (law enforcement project) would have been read by Officer Turner as basic

training. That paper described the investigation of Freenet cases and how Freenet operates very differently than Off. Turner's description (FOAF v roughly even).

Conclusion

"A defendant must make a substantial preliminary showing' that the government made a false statement in the warrant affidavit" (Govt. Reply, p.13)

"*Ofc. Turner chose an example where the actual number of blocks falls close to but outside of the predicted range in order to demonstrate that the model is not a perfect mirror of the software"* (Govt. Reply, p. 6)

Corbett and the other cases we cited *are* examples of actual evidence showing that the statements at issue are objectively false.

The government contradictorily states, "*The phrase "even share" is not in Ofc. Turner's affidavit. The concept of even share is not in Ofc. Turner's affidavit either." (Govt. Reply, p.5)*. The government then continues to say*: "However, Dr. Levine's testing has shown that an even share model does, in practice, accurately predict whether a particular device is an original requestor"(Govt. Reply, p.11)*. Does the government support or reject the even share model?

We believe there are multiple issues that need to be addressed through testimony by Officer Turner at a Franks hearing. In addition, we are requesting additional time to present the Court with FBI cases showing multiple FBI nodes connected to the same suspect before the date of the execution of the Turner Affidavit.

Attachment A. Showing the Summarized Data For Each Case

The actual raw data spreadsheets are provided separately.

	US v Corbett, New York									
			FOI #1			FOI #2			FOI #3	
	LE #2763	LE #2618	LE #3026	LE #3083	LE #2854	LE #2751	LE #2763	LE #3036	LE #3026	LE #3083
First Block Observed	2019 11/05	2019 11/05	2019 11/05	2019 11/05	2019 10/14	2019 10/14	2019 11/05	2019 11/04	2019 11/05	2019 11/05
	14:31:53	14:33:43	14:33:55	14:34:32	16:12:33	16:12:57	14:17:55	15:48:22	14:16:25	14:16:34
Last Block Observed	15:20:11	15:08:25	15:21:19	15:21:20	17:28:52	17:10:30	15:05:53	14:59:51	15:05:26	15:00:53
Time required to receive requests	0:48:18	0:34:42	0:47:24	0:46:48	1:16:19	0:57:33	0:47:58	23:11:29	0:49:01	0:44:19
Minimum blocks	1403	1403	1403	1403	2774	2774	1218	1218	1218	1218
Maximum blocks	2815	2815	2815	2815	5575	5575	2452	2452	2452	2452
Requests received	29	11	10	17	42	4	25	12	5	19
Average peers of suspect node	51.4	50.5	51.9	51.5	55.4	55.8	50.8	51.6	52.2	50.5
% of even-share of min blocks	106.2%	39.6%	37.0%	62.4%	83.9%	8.0%	104.3%	50.8%	21.4%	78.8%
Even share number - expected requests	27	28	27	27	50	50	24	24	23	24
Range of Expected Requests	27 to 55	28 to 56	27 to 54	27 to 55	50 to 101	50 to 100	24 to 48	24 to 48	23 to 47	24 to 49

	State W v Mcxxxxxx							
	FOI #1				FOI #2		FOI #3	
	LE #1774	LE #837			LE #837	LE #1774	LE #1774	LE # 837
First Block Observed	2018/4/25	2018/4/25			2018/04/25	2018/04/25	2018/04/24	2018/04/24
	00:40:36	00:40:36			00:36:28	00:36:36	23:20:02	23:20:11
Last Block Observed	01:14:28	1:05:59			01:05:59	01:40:38	23:26:55	23:26:44
Time required to receive requests	0:33:52	0:25:23			0:29:31	1:04:02	0:06:53	0:06:33
Minimum blocks	2,096	2,096			7,163	7,163	1,509	1,509
Maximum blocks	4,210	4,210			14,108	14,108	3,037	3,037
ACTUAL Requests received	83	39			96	202	65	32
Average peers of suspect node	54	55			56.1	55.4	50.6	50.4
% of even-share of min blocks	213.8%	102.3%			75.2%	156.2%	218.0%	106.9%
Even share number - expected requests	39	38			128	129	30	30
Range of Expected Requests	39 to 78	38 to 77			128 to 251	129 to 255	142 to 279	142 to 280
	Selected false node - sum of requests (122)				Selected false node(298)		Selected false node (97)	

	US v Case X chart 1							
	FOI #1				FOI #2		FOI #3	
	LE #333795	LE #334199	LE #339258		LE #333795		LE #333795	
First Block Observed	2021/06/23	2021/06/23	2021/06/25		2021/06/23		2021/06/23	
	11:36:35	12:16:54	02:05:33		10:24:51		12:27:02	
Last Block Observed	12:04:53	12:16:54	02:08:01		10:44:42		12:56:05	
Time required to receive requests	0:28:18	0:00:00	0:02:28		0:19:51		0:29:03	
Minimum blocks	1,197	1,197	1,197		1,173		1,047	
Maximum blocks	2,411	2,411	2,411		2,357		2,104	
ACTUAL Requests received	21	1	3		24		22	
Average peers of suspect node	62.7	67	64		64.4		66.6	
% of even-share of min blocks	110.0%	5.6%	16.0%		131.8%		139.9%	
Even share number - expected requests	19	18	19		18		16	
Range of Expected Requests	19 to 38	18 to 36	19 to 38		18 to 37		16 to 32	

US v Case X chart 2

	FOI #1			FOI #2		FOI #3
	LE #332134	LE #333815	LE #702445	LE #333815	:E #332134	LE #333815
First Block Observed	2021/06/18	2021/06/18	2021/06/18	2021/06/18	2021/06/18	2021/06/18
	06:56:37	07:50:40	21:46:09	15:44:44	15:50:31	20:13:07
Last Block Observed	10:06:29	10:12:52	22:02:50	21:41:46	16:13:48	20:51:50
Time required to receive requests	3:09:52	2:22:12	0:16:41	5:57:02	0:23:17	0:29:03
Minimum blocks	1,307	1,307	1,307	2,972	2,972	1,051
Maximum blocks	2,631	2,631	2,631	5,900	5,900	2,103
ACTUAL Requests received	21	1	3	43	7	36
Average peers of suspect node	62.7	67	64	66.9	71.1	64.2
% of even-share of min blocks	100.7%	5.1%	14.7%	96.8%	16.7%	219.9%
Even share number - expected requests	21	20	20	44	42	16
Range of Expected Requests	21 to 42	20 to 39	20 to 41	18 to 37	42 to 83	16 to 33

US v Case X chart 3

	FOI #1			FOI #2			FOI #3		
	LE #332134	LE #333562	LE #333997	LE #333997	LE #332134	LE #333562	LE #332134	LE #333562	LE #333997
First Block Observed	2021/06/16	2021/06/16	2021/06/16	2021/06/16	2021/06/16	2021/06/16	2021/06/16	2021/06/16	2021/06/16
	07:47:40	07:47:52	07:52:33	19:15:11	19:15:32	19:19:23	07:53:12	08:06:06	08:08:21
Last Block Observed	10:01:06	9:58:37	10:06:13	20:23:47	20:28:36	20:28:42	08:58:24	08:58:17	08:38:35
Time required to receive requests	2:13:26	2:10:45	2:13:40	1:08:36	1:13:04	1:09:19	1:05:12	0:52:11	0:30:14
Minimum blocks	1,203	1,203	1,203	3,250	3,250	3,250	652	652	652
Maximum blocks	2,417	2,417	2,417	6,408	6,408	6,408	1,315	1,315	1,315
ACTUAL Requests received	53	15	10	12	143	57	25	7	5
Average peers of suspect node	61.6	61.8	61.1	67.8	67.8	68.1	62.2	62.1	62.4
% of even-share of min blocks	271.4%	77.1%	50.8%	25.0%	298.3%	119.4%	238.5%	66.7%	47.9%
Even share number - expected requests	20	19	20	48	48	48	10	10	10
Range of Expected Requests	20 to 39	19 to 39	20 to 40	48 to 95	48 to 95	48 to 94	10 to 21	10 to 21	10 to 21

US v Case X chart 4

	FOI #1				FOI #2			FOI #3	
	LE #333997	LE #334070	LE #333740	LE #333343	LE #334245	LE #333997		LE #332134	LE #333562	LE #333997
First Block Observed	2021/06/20	2021/06/20	2021/06/20	2021/06/20	2021/06/22	2021/06/22		2021/06/22	2021/06/22	
	19:35:49	19:36:26	19:41:07	19:52:26	00:17:43	01:35:16		02:33:35	02:34:25	
Last Block Observed	19:35:49	20:43:13	20:51:11	20:47:49	01:40:49	01:41:18		03:11:03	03:19:38	
Time required to receive requests	0:00:00	1:06:47	1:10:04	0:55:23	1:24:29	0:06:02		0:37:28	0:45:13	
Minimum blocks	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	2,292	2,292		1,416	1,416	
Maximum blocks	2,098	2,098	2,098	2,098	4,602	4,602		2,848	2,848	
ACTUAL Requests received	1	20	40	8	70	3		13	81	
Average peers of suspect node	70	67.4	67.1	67.4	64.8	64.3		62.2	62.1	
% of even-share of min blocks	6.7%	129.5%	257.8%	51.8%	197.9%	8.4%		57.1%	355.2%	
Even share number - expected requests	15	15	16	15	35	36		23	23	
Range of Expected Requests	15 to 30	15 to 31	16 to 31	15 to 31	35 to 71	36 to 72		10 to 21	10 to 21	
	pass time does not match									

US v Case X chart 5

	FOI #1				FOI #2			FOI #3		
	LE #333295	LE #702149	LE #702405	LE #702391	LE #339447	LE #339494	LE #333295	LE #702149	LE #702405	LE #702391
First Block Observed	2021/08/06	2021/08/06	2021/08/06	2021/08/06	2021/06/26	2021/06/26	2021/08/06	2021/08/06	2021/08/06	2021/08/06
	19:23:06	19:29:51	19:46:14	20:57:52	19:53:40	20:20:02	20:06:34	20:08:50	20:09:24	20:09:24
Last Block Observed	8/9 7:33:13	20:41:55	8/10 20:17:	8/10 17:04:	23:45:17	21:11:53	20:44:31	20:45:32	20:42:36	20:42:36
Time required to receive requests	60:10:07	1:12:04	96:30:50	92:06:48	3:51:37	0:51:51	0:37:57	0:36:42	0:33:12	0:33:12
Minimum blocks	3,206	3,206	3,206	3,206	25,622	25,622	1,040	1,040	1,040	1,040
Maximum blocks	6,412	6,412	6,412	6,412	50,172	50,172	2,097	2,097	2,097	2,097
ACTUAL Requests received	429	78	212	305	286	108	33	24	8	1
Average peers of suspect node	61.9	46.2	66.4	66.7	64.2	87.1	52.3	53.4	52.1	0
% of even-share of min blocks	828.3%	112.4%	439.1%	634.5%	71.7%	36.7%	166.0%	123.2%	40.1%	0.0%
Even share number - expected requests	52	69	48	48	399	294	20	19	20	#DIV/0!
Range of Expected Requests	52 to 104	69 to 139	48 to 97	48 to 96	399 to 781	294 to 576	20 to 40	19 to 39	20 to 40	
	60 hours		96 hours	92 hours						

US v Case X chart 6

	FOI #1			FOI #2				FOI #3		
	LE #333795	LE #334199		LE #333295	LE #702405	LE #339891	LE #702391	LE #702405	LE #333295	LE #702391
First Block Observed	2021/06/23	2021/06/23		2021/08/07	2021/08/07	2021/08/07	2021/08/07	2021/08/08	2021/08/08	2021/08/08
	11:41:43	12:23:10		01:53:25	01:53:44	23:30:53	01:10:38	00:24:27	18:58:51	19:42:55
Last Block Observed	13:58:54	13:47:12		8/8 10:05:06	/10 20:10:09	00:20:31	10:15:18	19:45:47	19:40:49	19:44:04
Time required to receive requests	2:17:11	1:24:02		32:11:41	90:16:25	0:49:38	9:04:40	19:21:20	0:41:58	0:01:09
Minimum blocks	4,589	4,589		4,827	4,827	4,827	4,827	4,603	4,603	4,603
Maximum blocks	8,974	8,974		9,463	9,463	9,463	9,463	9,221	9,221	9,221
ACTUAL Requests received	66	7		65	15	2	12	36	72	2
Average peers of suspect node	64.9	66		61.1	63.5	65	64.2	65.5	65.5	65.5
% of even-share of min blocks	93.3%	10.1%		82.3%	19.7%	2.7%	16.0%	51.2%	102.5%	2.8%
Even share number - expected requests	71	70		79	76	74	75	70	70	70
Range of Expected Requests	71 to 138	70 to 136		79 to 155	76 to 149	74 to 146	75 to 147	70 to 141	70 to 141	70 to 141
			none of these match the pass (63)							

US v Case X chart 7

	FOI #1			FOI #2			FOI #3	
	LE #334078	LE #334073		LE #333295	LE #702405		LE #334078	LE #334073
First Block Observed	2021/06/13	2021/06/13		2021/06/13	2021/06/13		2021/06/13	2021/06/13
	11:05:02	11:05:07		11:08:15	11:08:40		11:11:52	11:17:05
Last Block Observed	11:20:54	11:19:27		13:47:17	13:43:19		14:06:32	14:02:00
Time required to receive requests	0:15:52	0:14:20		2:39:02	2:34:39		2:54:40	2:44:55
Minimum blocks	1,253	1,253		2,022	2,022		2,950	2,950
Maximum blocks	2,517	2,517		4,075	4,075		5,901	5,901
ACTUAL Requests received	27	14		14	30		48	28
Average peers of suspect node	61.8	61.7		60.9	60.5		60.3	60
% of even-share of min blocks	133.2%	68.9%		42.2%	89.8%		98.1%	56.9%
Even share number - expected requests	20	20		33	33		49	49
Range of Expected Requests	20 to 41	20 to 41		33 to 67	33 to 67		49 to 98	49 to 98

ATTACHMENT B. Raw FBI Spreadsheet Data

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	108.30.166.37
Geo Location:	US,NY, The Bronx — Verizon Fios
Location ID:	0.290096253736442

File of Interest #1

SHA1 Hash:	EISD4IT336ECGP2YFYHDYW273ME4ET3R
Possible File Name:	Boy Girl Suck1.mp4
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@z9FUuLnZEYkFPg9yD3lwBLn1JBMQeok5yCoASVsFyJk,vC2lpeyjXW7VDzCFVwbzK-Jp4LCwakW~PXVSXFur6ho,AAMC--8/Boy%20Girl%20Suck1 mp4

Blocks Required:	1,403	Total Blocks:	2,815	~File Size(KB):	44,896	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 30 Rows	LE # 2763	LE # 2618	LE # 3026	LE # 3083
First Block Observed:	2019/11/05 14:31:53	2019/11/05 14 31 53	2019/11/05 14 31 53	2019/11/05 14:33:43	2019/11/05 14:33 55	2019/11/05 14:34 32
Last Block Observed:	2019/11/05 15:21:20	2019/11/05 15 20:11	2019/11/05 15 20:11	2019/11/05 15:08 25	2019/11/05 15:21:19	2019/11/05 15:21 20
Overall Runtime:	0:49:27	0:48:18	0:48:18	0:34:42	0:47:24	0:46:48
Average Peers	51.3	51.4	51.4	50.5	51.9	51.5
Total Unique Requests Logged:	76	29	29	11	10	17
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

12/23/2019 14:39

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	108.30.166.37
Geo Location:	US,NY, The Bronx — Verizon Fios
Location ID:	0.644465390284740

File of Interest #2

SHA1 Hash:	GVYIQ7QYFOJBGYMELSSMOT5W7AMGXRVX
Possible File Name:	20191001_myhomeismycastle.mkv
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@D-ZB1Tbp1kbFBSZN9RUKqWmsHob0zz0FEdcnnBi0D-0,bTcx1Z-VfhZexdDa40ysvrGCDZnfq5MCSBSiXd5JKxs,AAMC--8/20191001_myhomeismycastle.mkv

Blocks Required:	2,774	Total Blocks:	5,575	~File Size(KB):	88,768	
	Overall Totals:	Fil ered: 43 Rows	LE # 2854	LE # 2751		
First Block Observed:	2019/10/14 16:12:33	2019/10/14 16:12 33	2019/10/14 16:12 33	2019/10/14 16:12 57		
Last Block Observed:	2019/10/14 17:32:15	2019/10/14 17 32:15	2019/10/14 17 28 52	2019/10/14 17:10 30		
Overall Runtime:	1:19:42	1:19:42	1:16:19	0:57:33		
Average Peers	55.4	55.4	55.4	55.8		
Total Unique Requests Logged:	46	42	42	4		
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

12/23/2019 14:39

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	108.30.166.37
Geo Location:	US,NY, The Bronx — Verizon Fios
Location ID:	0.290096253736442

File of Interest #3

SHA1 Hash:	Q6DGK5K725P6K2P4DI7J3WMA6FBSIURM
Possible File Name:	9yo Princess show us her wonderful body 2019.wmv
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@xdG7KLNEaHdzOmEPR2FCqtapHeKuPay3~8I5EeWaVcc,UNheM1Xwcf-p8pCytG3gUpc3Z6PiA~h3IgbN5rUkYzc,AAMC--8/9yo%20Princess%20show%20us%20her%20wonderful%20body%202019.wmv

Blocks Required:	1,218	Total Blocks:	2,452	~File Size(KB):	38,976	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 26 Rows	LE # 3036	LE # 3026	LE # 3083	LE # 2763
First Block Observed:	2019/11/04 15:48:22	2019/11/05 14:17 55	2019/11/04 15:48 22	2019/11/05 14:16 25	2019/11/05 14:16 34	2019/11/05 14:17 55
Last Block Observed:	2019/11/05 15:05:53	2019/11/05 15 05 53	2019/11/05 14 59 51	2019/11/05 15:05 26	2019/11/05 15:00 53	2019/11/05 15:05 53
Overall Runtime:	23:17:31	0:47:58	23:11:29	0:49:01	0:44:19	0:47:58
Average Peers	51.1	50.8	51.6	52.2	50.5	50.8
Total Unique Requests Logged:	78	25	12	5	19	25
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

12/23/2019 14:39

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	[redacted]173.202
Geo Location:	US,[redacted] Spectrum
Location ID:	[redacted]

File of Interest #3

Possible File Name:	0498838601.flv
SHA1 Hash:	OAXH7U3KKTVND4Y3LZ4LSN7OME4QLX2F
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@b2aOq6~LFq3ETC5Newv8myUMo05b6JfyyFzmNjf5 7YU,Sf6jNLI7bcprj2XKWtsTgy29WV-282f77EMs5J1tpq0,AAMC--8/0498838601.flv

Minimum Data Blocks Required:	1,509	Total Blocks:	3,037	~File Size(KB):	48,288	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 104 Rows	LE # 1774	LE # 837		
First Block Observed:	2018/04/24 23:20:02	2018/04/24 23:20:02	2018/04/24 23:20:02	2018/04/24 23:20:11		
Last Block Observed:	2018/04/24 23:27:07	2018/04/24 23:27:07	2018/04/24 23:26:55	2018/04/24 23:26:44		
Overall Runtime:	0:07:05	0:07:05	0:06:53	0:06:33		
Average Peers	50.5	50.5	50.6	50.4		
Total Unique Requests Logged:	97	97	65	32		
% of Even Share of Total Blocks:	**Stat Test:**	**161%**	**108%**	**53%**		
% of Even Share of Min. Blocks:	Pass	**325%**	**218%**	**107%**		

7/16/2018 13:56

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	[redacted]173.202
Geo Location:	US,[redacted] Spectrum
Location ID:	[redacted]

File of Interest #2

Possible File Name:	Daphne-9yo-Dutch-girl.mp4
SHA1 Hash:	UYDKDBRB4J6A67RDFFV4PN564XXGFJS6
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@a0VQm6o2uLR6QrHCqzcjtOVQ-01NNMoGU2xAHIMSDrc,CkcW9lx844AN~5pMXhP488cTg pA4qqwWOg~6nkqOgDc,AAMC--8/Daphne-9yo-Dutch-girl.mp4

Minimum Data Blocks Required:	7,163	Total Blocks:	14,108	~File Size(KB):	229,216	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 310 Rows	LE # 837	LE # 1774		
First Block Observed:	2018/04/25 00:36:28	2018/04/25 00:36:28	2018/04/25 00:36:28	2018/04/25 00:36:36		
Last Block Observed:	2018/04/25 01:40:43	2018/04/25 01:40:43	2018/04/25 01:05:59	2018/04/25 01:40:38		
Overall Runtime:	1:04:15	1:04:15	0:29:31	1:04:02		
Average Peers	55.7	55.7	56.1	55.4		
Total Unique Requests Logged:	298	298	96	202		
% of Even Share of Total Blocks:	**Stat Test:**	**118%**	**38%**	**79%**		
% of Even Share of Min. Blocks:	Pass	**232%**	**75%**	**156%**		

7/16/2018 13:56

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	[redacted]173.202
Geo Location:	US,[redacted] Spectrum
Location ID:	[redacted]

File of Interest #1

Possible File Name:	Laura-and-Garry-compilation.mp4
SHA1 Hash:	JBVIWPK7V47NKFGBJSPNYUUF47NFL6WI
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@-eCvFpfP5oFPPrebqVSMA44zwrkD87-zwYLsz7AbzTU,iLgZN8Mb6LgqxpIT4gzJeRax22fTI3HX9m Zywoy~zXM,AAMC--8/Laura-and-Garry-compilation.mp4

Minimum Blocks Required:	2,096	Total Blocks:	4,210	~File Size(KB):	67,072	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 124 Rows	LE # 1774	LE # 837		
First Block Observed:	2018/04/25 00:40:36	2018/04/25 00:40:36	2018/04/25 00:40:36	2018/04/25 00:40:36		
Last Block Observed:	2018/04/25 01:14:28	2018/04/25 01:14:28	2018/04/25 01:14:28	2018/04/25 01:05:59		
Overall Runtime:	0:33:52	0:33:52	0:33:52	0:25:23		
Average Peers	54.3	54.3	54.0	55.0		
Total Unique Requests Logged:	122	122	83	39		
% of Even Share of Total Blocks:	**Stat Test:**	**157%**	**106%**	**51%**		
% of Even Share of Min. Blocks:	Pass	**316%**	**214%**	**102%**		

7/16/2018 13:56

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #1

SHA1 Hash:	ERIJYABX5LL3EBSIBYYCEV4PIDB6R5CG					
Possible File Name:	A Very Cute Latin Boy (9 in 1).mkv					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@5DWT3EjN~gU6clWdpNzRJFLWjv~Flj67Bxth0cb0lLE,lgK91VnFFljhPHeAxeCAeOcbwEb2oCx8HPP6wqbq0JM,AAMC--8/A%20Very%20Cute%20Latin%20Boy%20%289%20in%201%29.mkv					
Blocks Required:	1,197	Total Blocks:	2,411	~File Size(KB):	38,304	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 21 Rows	LE # 333795	LE # 334199	LE # 339258	
First Block Observed:	2021/06/23 11:36:35	2021/06/23 11:36:35	2021/06/23 11:36:35	2021/06/23 12:16:54	2021/06/25 02:05:33	
Last Block Observed:	2021/06/25 02:08:01	2021/06/23 12:04:53	2021/06/23 12:04:53	2021/06/23 12:16:54	2021/06/25 02:08:01	
Overall Runtime:	38:31:26	0:28:18	0:28:18	0:00:00	0:02:28	
Average Peers	63.0	62.7	62.7	67.0	64.0	
Total Unique Requests Logged:	25	21	21	1	3	
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

8/10/2021 17:03

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #2

SHA1 Hash:	AHBZFW3ILMYBC4QBVLBNVGAH4BSRGACK					
Possible File Name:	RTS0250_6.mp4					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@S0lTDwf5l4RMPrjkuisDb38hClJFRpSP2GU1rLxdSfU,L8rB2x7rKk8Mt71mcizZqDZ4J25Tsgvp7meTVXD~n6A,AAMC--8/RTS0250_6.mp4					
Blocks Required:	1,173	Total Blocks:	2,357	~File Size(KB):	37,536	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 24 Rows	LE # 333795			
First Block Observed:	2021/06/23 10:24:51	2021/06/23 10:24:51	2021/06/23 10:24:51			
Last Block Observed:	2021/06/23 10:44:42	2021/06/23 10:44:42	2021/06/23 10:44:42			
Overall Runtime:	0:19:51	0:19:51	0:19:51			
Average Peers	64.4	64.4	64.4			
Total Unique Requests Logged:	24	24	24			
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

8/10/2021 17:03

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #3

SHA1 Hash:	I3WYC5L5JGBVASI3VTGYFEOT6JNNEHTC					
Possible File Name:	VID_20200922_210437.mp4					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@lqNbS5lIXjpdKvFzoFiFtBeXTGP2JHo41rLSz6VFAA0,0Oj8w3mB0G71pY7evaYV4qqUkZ56t24NPbdmSEsxIss,AAMC--8/VID_20200922_210437.mp4					
Blocks Required:	1,047	Total Blocks:	2,104	~File Size(KB):	33,504	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 23 Rows	LE # 333795			
First Block Observed:	2021/06/23 12:27:02	2021/06/23 12:27:02	2021/06/23 12:27:02			
Last Block Observed:	2021/06/23 12:56:05	2021/06/23 12:56:05	2021/06/23 12:56:05			
Overall Runtime:	0:29:03	0:29:03	0:29:03			
Average Peers	66.7	66.6	66.6			
Total Unique Requests Logged:	22	22	22			
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #1

SHA1 Hash:	SX7BIDPDBGFWGS32D4LJRK4QR4FOLDWV					
Possible File Name:	pe732.wmv					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@BQDYZHyBsOC6vqbQ-yxYbMFlnyW7g7KzpPBAy-9SRG8,MBzHlb~HqutOtgi-R~O8DqYt6urQiZVi8yYdWaNQ3gM,AAMC--8/pe732.wmv					
Blocks Required:	1,307	Total Blocks:	2,631	~File Size(KB):	41,824	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 30 Rows	LE # 332134	LE # 333815	LE # 702445	
First Block Observed:	2021/06/18 06:56:37	2021/06/18 07:50:40	2021/06/18 06:56:37	2021/06/18 07:50:40	2021/08/08 21:46:09	
Last Block Observed:	2021/08/08 22:02:50	2021/06/18 10:12:52	2021/06/18 10:06:29	2021/06/18 10:12:52	2021/08/08 22:02:50	
Overall Runtime:	1239:06:13	2:22:12	3:09:52	2:22:12	0:16:41	
Average Peers	71.2	71.7	71.3	71.7	66.3	
Total Unique Requests Logged:	39	27	9	27	3	
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

8/10/2021 16:54

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #2

SHA1 Hash:	HVZT3ITML7UDVGLNM5FZSG5A7ZQ2SPK5					
Possible File Name:	UNSEEN307.mp4					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@F3Qz-j~PoRL07eh7KLmOHwCPgFCxCEs1ZKR9QMc~mU0,z~72uvEsxxLNwXmoy1vXn97xoX1UHhRQw1s~o~AdlbQ,AAMC--8/UNSEEN307.mp4					
Blocks Required:	2,972	Total Blocks:	5,900	~File Size(KB):	95,104	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 50 Rows	LE # 333815	LE # 332134		
First Block Observed:	2021/06/18 15:44:44	2021/06/18 15:44:44	2021/06/18 15:44:44	2021/06/18 15:50:31		
Last Block Observed:	2021/06/18 21:47:24	2021/06/18 21:47:24	2021/06/18 21:41:46	2021/06/18 16:13:48		
Overall Runtime:	6:02:40	6:02:40	5:57:02	0:23:17		
Average Peers	67.3	66.9	66.9	71.1		
Total Unique Requests Logged:	50	43	43	7		
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

8/10/2021 16:54

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #3

SHA1 Hash:	CGYPVBVEMD3J2KHDQQ62ASN3PSUIT73G					
Possible File Name:	10.rar					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@Ytdya34T6We2gy5Qx9ddVOB9aRE7NbED8ai4AvjYFRY,fORqn3fxzDzxUkui3Gsaup0taRuHg4y5T-d-Ocr4Be0,AAMC--8/10.rar					
Blocks Required:	1,051	Total Blocks:	2,103	~File Size(KB):	33,632	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 38 Rows	LE # 333815			
First Block Observed:	2021/06/18 20:13:07	2021/06/18 20:13:07	2021/06/18 20:13:07			
Last Block Observed:	2021/06/18 20:53:23	2021/06/18 20:53:23	2021/06/18 20:51:50			
Overall Runtime:	0:40:16	0:40:16	0:38:43			
Average Peers	64.3	64.3	64.2			
Total Unique Requests Logged:	36	36	36			
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #1

SHA1 Hash:	5NURKGQDGMABFZSEU5V5A2GNF524LGVF					
Possible File Name:	02cindy.rar					
Possible Manifest Key:	SSK@1mK8W0EUYUaiD1LOLDlEmRSJCT3zdpwUZlJpUipQfq4,ml2faZPozvDhHqumLxrVw2c~lg VBehA6hJUAy9ym41s,AQACAAE/02cindy.rar					
Blocks Required:	1,203	Total Blocks:	2,417	~File Size(KB):	38,496	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 57 Rows	LE # 332134	LE # 333562	LE # 333997	
First Block Observed:	2021/06/16 07:47:40	2021/06/16 07:47:40	2021/06/16 07:47:40	2021/06/16 07:47:52	2021/06/16 07:52:33	
Last Block Observed:	2021/06/16 10:08:13	2021/06/16 10:01:29	2021/06/16 10:01:06	2021/06/16 09:58:37	2021/06/16 10:06:13	
Overall Runtime:	2:20:33	2:13:49	2:13:26	2:10:45	2:13:40	
Average Peers	61.7	61.6	61.6	61.8	61.1	
Total Unique Requests Logged:	78	53	53	15	10	
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

8/10/2021 16:53

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #2

SHA1 Hash:	U5AT6H447I74YG7TXK2YSFCBSWGLDQAP					
Possible File Name:	09mdog_08 BestLive_www.rarevideofree.com.wmv					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@SxF07Qw80zVXij-nWYhCbHjDDalUk3g4gqDNwE~Z0cw,ugJs5zgHW01pAt3f3-qzrB894WbIlSUaKZwWcKZbeGY,AAMC--8/09mdog_08%20BestLive_www.rarevideofree.com.wmv					
Blocks Required:	3,250	Total Blocks:	6,408	~File Size(KB):	104,000	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 151 Rows	LE # 333997	LE # 332134	LE # 333562	
First Block Observed:	2021/06/16 19:15:11	2021/06/16 19:15:32	2021/06/16 19:15:11	2021/06/16 19:15:32	2021/06/16 19:19:23	
Last Block Observed:	2021/06/16 20:29:36	2021/06/16 20:29:36	2021/06/16 20:23:47	2021/06/16 20:28:36	2021/06/16 20:28:42	
Overall Runtime:	1:14:25	1:14:04	1:08:36	1:13:04	1:09:19	
Average Peers	68.1	67.8	67.8	67.8	68.1	
Total Unique Requests Logged:	211	143	12	143	57	
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

8/10/2021 16:53

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #3

SHA1 Hash:	HHUCPYC2BHYXSE2NSL4RB47QA3INFVOA					
Possible File Name:	04.MPG					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@I~rVQcO-IVohMZSt1zaboUYCYnn036wW6guGb-uT4Uk,M6JLVIcYGhxXzx-lowuLDDsoYKiE88nykgPs1uoQQSs,AAMC--8/04.MPG					
Blocks Required:	652	Total Blocks:	1,315	~File Size(KB):	20,864	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 27 Rows	LE # 332134	LE # 333562	LE # 333997	
First Block Observed:	2021/06/16 07:53:12	2021/06/16 07:53:12	2021/06/16 07:53:12	2021/06/16 08:06:06	2021/06/16 08:08:21	
Last Block Observed:	2021/06/16 09:00:29	2021/06/16 09:00:29	2021/06/16 08:58:24	2021/06/16 08:58:17	2021/06/16 08:38:35	
Overall Runtime:	1:07:17	1:07:17	1:05:12	0:52:11	0:30:14	
Average Peers	62.1	62.2	62.2	62.1	62.4	
Total Unique Requests Logged:	37	25	25	7	5	
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #1

SHA1 Hash:	2HDNVCEUCPG3ECHLHSDJTH7TMZDJKO5C					
Possible File Name:	Boy & Girl.mp4					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@~LbKXV63b2cHlb0sSZGp5qVhCw6QtrymK-yFdLt2oJI,zmNm2ii4O7b1OyVnnpYvrj0uwPpKTscUNke4G1TeCa0,AAMC--8/Boy%20%26%20Girl.mp4					
Blocks Required:	1,041	Total Blocks:	2,098	~File Size(KB):	33,312	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 43 Rows	LE # 333997	LE # 334070	LE # 333740	LE # 333343
First Block Observed:	2021/06/20 19:35:49	2021/06/20 19:41:07	2021/06/20 19:35:49	2021/06/20 19:36:26	2021/06/20 19:41:07	2021/06/20 19:52:26
Last Block Observed:	2021/06/20 20:53:16	2021/06/20 20:53:16	2021/06/20 19:35:49	2021/06/20 20:43:13	2021/06/20 20:51:11	2021/06/20 20:47:49
Overall Runtime:	1:17:27	1:12:09	0:00:00	1:06:47	1:10:04	0:55:23
Average Peers	66.6	67.1	70.0	67.4	67.1	67.4
Total Unique Requests Logged:	69	40	1	20	40	8
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

8/10/2021 17:01

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #2

SHA1 Hash:	Y5ZEYO6JW2VKVVUHDGWRPBQAC5IFSOO2					
Possible File Name:	Periscope 2019.mp4					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@MIg~X-Hf5ClOrJowun1sRXgarOveAzyLi8yMfEczpjQ,J6YVpX7VhC00LxOwovjpexLCltY~LRml1pLsMJ9lSyg,AAMC--8/Periscope%202019.mp4					
Blocks Required:	2,292	Total Blocks:	4,602	~File Size(KB):	73,344	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 83 Rows	LE # 334245	LE # 333997		
First Block Observed:	2021/06/22 00:17:43	2021/06/22 00:17:43	2021/06/22 00:17:43	2021/06/22 01:35:16		
Last Block Observed:	2021/06/22 01:42:12	2021/06/22 01:42:12	2021/06/22 01:40:49	2021/06/22 01:41:18		
Overall Runtime:	1:24:29	1:24:29	1:23:06	0:06:02		
Average Peers	64.8	64.8	64.8	64.3		
Total Unique Requests Logged:	73	70	70	3		
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

8/10/2021 17:01

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #3

SHA1 Hash:	G66AQHNQZYBCWBMO62QZXDZJHRLM2AC2					
Possible File Name:	jb22-027.mp4					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@ixNhOd5dOaJYRaJjwWyHyqYHx5e17xCwL9ClDR-JP5o,MJAFC5RPsy8zg-bYQ~dAQVM4HzWICNRc6ZUHpZQNZjE,AAMC--8/jb22-027.mp4					
Blocks Required	1,416	Total Blocks:	2,848	~File Size(KB):	45,312	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 121 Rows	LE # 333997	LE # 334245		
First Block Observed:	2021/06/22 02:33:35	2021/06/22 02:34:25	2021/06/22 02:33:35	2021/06/22 02:34:25		
Last Block Observed:	2021/06/22 03:23:10	2021/06/22 03:23:10	2021/06/22 03:11:03	2021/06/22 03:19:38		
Overall Runtime:	0:49:35	0:48:45	0:37:28	0:45:13		
Average Peers	66.3	65.5	65.2	65.5		
Total Unique Requests Logged:	94	81	13	81		
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #1

SHA1 Hash:	BBVPCQWKFCHAKVU7USBCU42V5YOJY3R7					
Possible File Name:	GO2001Koeln_xvid.avi					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@9TToc5Kkv1rnb5hvni7-W9jOZ7Hn3xaI149hSWS0KxM,dCs8XxmR-dRuiYTeesiDXSSmtkrcDE~Qh4qBl~YzWS8,AAMC--8/GO2001Koeln_xvid.avi					
Blocks Required:	3,206	Total Blocks:	6,412	~File Size(KB):	102,592	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 78 Rows	LE # 333295	LE # 702149	LE # 702405	LE # 702391
First Block Observed:	2021/08/06 19:23:06	2021/08/06 19:29:51	2021/08/06 19:23:06	2021/08/06 19:29:51	2021/08/06 19:46:14	2021/08/06 20:57:52
Last Block Observed:	2021/08/10 21:10:44	2021/08/06 20:41:55	2021/08/09 07:33:13	2021/08/06 20:41:55	2021/08/10 20:17:04	2021/08/10 17:04:40
Overall Runtime:	97:47:38	1:12:04	60:10:07	1:12:04	96:30:50	92:06:48
Average Peers	66.4	46.2	61.9	46.2	66.4	66.7
Total Unique Requests Logged:	1477	78	429	78	212	305
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

8/10/2021 17:10

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #2

SHA1 Hash:	NBKDICDLLNK3DJD5UFTA3E7PNY5JUMBC					
Possible File Name:	Smurfette Pics.rar					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@gTVzOVsQdIhzbSjCbgLlaEWubHW0FW6jOTb2xHL0aYY,0nIV7dgducmJBmM1r9wUqn4MZItxMZj0ISXDLHie22k,AAMC--8/Smurfette%20Pics.rar					
Blocks Required:	25,622	Total Blocks:	50,172	~File Size(KB):	819,904	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 296 Rows	LE # 339447	LE # 339494		
First Block Observed:	2021/06/26 19:53:40	2021/06/26 19:53:40	2021/06/26 19:53:40	2021/06/26 20:20:02		
Last Block Observed:	2021/06/26 23:45:47	2021/06/26 23:45:47	2021/06/26 23:45:17	2021/06/26 21:11:53		
Overall Runtime:	3:52:07	3:52:07	3:51:37	0:51:51		
Average Peers	65.0	64.2	64.2	67.1		
Total Unique Requests Logged:	394	286	286	108		
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

8/10/2021 17:10

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #3

SHA1 Hash:	GLOJQY4UBBUKKQGPE3GY52WVI7UVIMLY					
Possible File Name:	eva.ionesco.mix.7z					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@U4R-04clgnInVYQJHj9XpBQBaPH7BYUi4oo1GUYKIck,DtHig730vJHLcBAAHC190HpJVS0xXXvgYFpTIOhVRV4,AAMC--8/eva.ionesco.mix.7z					
Blocks Required:	1,040	Total Blocks:	2,097	~File Size(KB):	33,280	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 34 Rows	LE # 333295	LE # 702149	LE # 702405	LE # 702391
First Block Observed:	2021/08/06 20:06:34	2021/08/06 20:06:34	2021/08/06 20:06:34	2021/08/06 20:08:50	2021/08/06 20:09:24	2021/08/06 20:09:24
Last Block Observed:	2021/08/06 20:53:33	2021/08/06 20:45:37	2021/08/06 20:44:31	2021/08/06 20:45:32	2021/08/06 20:42:36	2021/08/06 20:42:36
Overall Runtime:	0:46:59	0:39:03	0:37:57	0:36:42	0:33:12	0:33:12
Average Peers	52.9	52.3	52.3	53.4	52.1	0.0
Total Unique Requests Logged:	65	33	33	24	8	1
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #1

SHA1 Hash:	YAZOGGBABQQYE47Y3HK7VTF5GKNIPCQG					
Possible File Name:	wanking for loliporn.mp4					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@KYSwKaSyGPqhCUHIsvz9IPMaDYcQog-0AaFJx8pf~XM,cb3Px-bPEMA9RbQS7WpoI5cu8XfqPJu18RRbAWJO~Jk,AAMC--8/wanking%20for%20loliporn.mp4					
Blocks Required:	4,589	Total Blocks:	8,974	~File Size(KB):	146,848	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 72 Rows	LE # 333795	LE # 334199		
First Block Observed:	2021/06/23 11:41:43	2021/06/23 11:41:43	2021/06/23 11:41:43	2021/06/23 12:23:10		
Last Block Observed:	2021/06/23 13:59:09	2021/06/23 13:59:09	2021/06/23 13:58:54	2021/06/23 13:47:12		
Overall Runtime:	2:17:26	2:17:26	2:17:11	1:24:02		
Average Peers	64.9	64.9	64.9	66.0		
Total Unique Requests Logged:	73	66	66	7		
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

8/10/2021 21:24

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #2

SHA1 Hash:	5KGMKSSITUTFDB76WAMFSYZ34PBPE7XR					
Possible File Name:	-lol-remastered.rar					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@ltQwSJRZxCHmUVVVsN8uJxcScNuBm6Z1BMUmcypKpKM,nA9lqcO8ShAqTn9abj1d9~f63i9GgnJGcZK3bN2M18Y,AAMC--8/-lol-remastered.rar					
Blocks Required:	4,827	Total Blocks:	9,463	~File Size(KB):	154,464	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 65 Rows	LE # 333295	LE # 702405	LE # 339891	LE # 702391
First Block Observed:	2021/08/07 01:53:25	2021/08/07 23:27:52	2021/08/07 01:53:25	2021/08/07 01:53:44	2021/08/07 23:30:53	2021/08/08 01:10:38
Last Block Observed:	2021/08/10 20:46:41	2021/08/08 10:11:01	2021/08/08 10:05:06	2021/08/10 20:10:09	2021/08/08 00:20:31	2021/08/08 10:15:18
Overall Runtime:	90:53:16	10:43:09	32:11:41	90:16:25	0:49:38	9:04:40
Average Peers	63.4	60.8	61.1	63.5	65.0	64.2
Total Unique Requests Logged:	141	63	65	15	2	12
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

8/10/2021 21:24

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #3

SHA1 Hash:	P7H7APMDITDFIVNGXJONPJGJYSDKIMFA					
Possible File Name:	White Dress inc.rar					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@j-hBwAoKh-WuH5OmgFEMNsZu2RxuzUNK1NY3OXo7z1c,-ga3zlaWnJ4IF-1kJScsCMjteMAmxH4LQWzucbO9ibA,AAMC--8/White%20Dress%20inc.rar					
Blocks Required:	4,603	Total Blocks:	9,221	~File Size(KB):	147,296	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 74 Rows	LE # 702405	LE # 333295	LE # 702391	
First Block Observed:	2021/08/08 00:24:27	2021/08/08 18:58:51	2021/08/08 00:24:27	2021/08/08 18:58:51	2021/08/08 19:42:55	
Last Block Observed:	2021/08/08 19:46:44	2021/08/08 19:41:05	2021/08/08 19:45:47	2021/08/08 19:40:49	2021/08/08 19:44:04	
Overall Runtime:	19:22:17	0:42:14	19:21:20	0:41:58	0:01:09	
Average Peers	65.3	65.5	65.5	65.5	65.5	
Total Unique Requests Logged:	110	72	36	72	2	
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #1

SHA1 Hash:	PSCOJAMSP4OOVSGB5LRGCK6BDTTRKTXE					
Possible File Name:	20.mp4					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@FAOaCsBk-GKh6dZXUSrBxLy6kuk1MFb7G9Y5bV9q67M,Z0hlux6XVtvLiaTmaDfd7AZxeBietgcE9~Qt5BQdyZw,AAMC--8/20.mp4					
Blocks Required:	1,253	Total Blocks:	2,517	~File Size(KB):	40,096	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 28 Rows	LE # 334078	LE # 334073		
First Block Observed:	2021/06/13 11:05:02	2021/06/13 11:05:02	2021/06/13 11:05:02	2021/06/13 11:05:07		
Last Block Observed:	2021/06/13 11:21:24	2021/06/13 11:21:24	2021/06/13 11:20:54	2021/06/13 11:19:27		
Overall Runtime:	0:16:22	0:16:22	0:15:52	0:14:20		
Average Peers	61.8	61.8	61.8	61.7		
Total Unique Requests Logged:	41	27	27	14		
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

8/10/2021 16:51

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #2

SHA1 Hash:	CKEETCPYRZXSLJOBVVOYN5EAMGSFBNQE					
Possible File Name:	22.MP4					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@GqJxOkitPv4q~WYntIQbI7a6hlw7fs8d4ZQ1a8nyKcI,AEHo1x2pOVsE-DnGEYhKkKTiyrz4u3gkuDTV7wXmCUY,AAMC--8/22.MP4					
Blocks Required:	2,022	Total Blocks:	4,075	~File Size(KB):	64,704	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 30 Rows	LE # 334073	LE # 334078		
First Block Observed:	2021/06/13 11:08:15	2021/06/13 11:08:40	2021/06/13 11:08:15	2021/06/13 11:08:40		
Last Block Observed:	2021/06/13 13:47:17	2021/06/13 13:43:19	2021/06/13 13:47:17	2021/06/13 13:43:19		
Overall Runtime:	2:39:02	2:34:39	2:39:02	2:34:39		
Average Peers	60.6	60.5	60.9	60.5		
Total Unique Requests Logged:	44	30	14	30		
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				

8/10/2021 16:51

Freenet Target Summary

IP Address:	XX.XXX.58.45	
Geo Location:	US,Case X	Spectrum
Location ID:		

File of Interest #3

SHA1 Hash:	LUYV4YZ3MQMOSFVS23PEI2U77MOLLVEU					
Possible File Name:	Marie - BJ And Anal Compilation.mp4					
Possible Manifest Key:	CHK@CzEkPG-4KEAqyZrf7Ipkq1zERlW8cTEkwkRgnHv7TA4,Svtbng78aqNqT8ehUxbR-UiQsE~qz5J9HHjCldNXRnU,AAMC--8/Marie%20-%20BJ%20And%20Anal%20Compilation.mp4					
Blocks Required:	2,950	Total Blocks:	5,901	~File Size(KB):	94,400	
	Overall Totals:	Filtered: 51 Rows	LE # 334078	LE # 334073		
First Block Observed:	2021/06/13 11:11:52	2021/06/13 11:11:52	2021/06/13 11:11:52	2021/06/13 11:17:05		
Last Block Observed:	2021/06/13 14:06:32	2021/06/13 14:06:32	2021/06/13 14:06:32	2021/06/13 14:02:00		
Overall Runtime:	2:54:40	2:54:40	2:54:40	2:44:55		
Average Peers	60.1	60.3	60.3	60.0		
Total Unique Requests Logged:	76	48	48	28		
Statistical Test Result:		Pass				